Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I do not know any such case. If the Hon. member bring to my notice any such case I will look into the matter.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್.—3,500 ಕೇಸುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಮತ್ತು ಮಾಲೀಕ ರಿಟ್‌ಪಿಟೀಷನ್ ಅಂತ ; ಹೇಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ? ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ವಿವಾದಗಳನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಆದೇಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯಗಳು 108 ಇವೆ. ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಯಾವ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಜಿ. ಹಾಲಪ್ಪ.—ನಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಕೊಡುವ ಪ್ರಪೋಷನ್ ಕೊಡುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ತಾವು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಬೈ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ನಲುವಾಗಿ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ರಿಟ್ ಪಿಟಿಷನ್‌ಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಅದು ನಿಜವಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ದೊಡ್ಡಬೊರೇ ಗೌಡ.—3,500 ರಿಟ್ ಪಿಟಿಷನ್‌ಗಳು ಇವೆ ಇಂದಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹಸ್ತಕ್ಷೇಪ, ಸ್ವಜನ ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದರೇ ಇಷ್ಟು ರಿಟ್ ಪಿಟಿಷನ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಯಿತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಆಗಲೇ ಒಂದಲ್ಲ ಎರಡು ಸಾರಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಸ್ತಕ್ಷೇಪವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಸ್ವಜನ ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ, ನಿಷ್ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ಆರ್ಡರ್‌ಗಳ ಮೇಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇವೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Sri B. B. SAYANAK.—May I know when Mysore State was renamed as New Mysore State ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Mysore State has not been renamed as New Mysore State. The hon. Member used that term ; instead of refusing to answer, we have given the answer.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹದೇವ್ ಜಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ಈ ರಿಟ್‌ಪಿಟಿಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತಗೊಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನಿಯಮ ಇದೆಯೇ ? ಒಂದು ಅವಧಿ ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ ? ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೇ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ವೇನು ? ಆ ರೀತಿಯ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟು ಇವೆ ? ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಲೀನಪ್ರದೇಶದವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟವು ಎಷ್ಟು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—4–5 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಿಲೀನಪ್ರದೇಶದವು ಎಷ್ಟು ಅಂತ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಪ್ರಾದೇಶಿಕ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಂತಹ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಕ್ಷಿಪ್ರವಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾದ ಮೇಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಸುಪ್ರೀಂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅಪೀಲು ಹೋಗತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಷ್ಟರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ, ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

Service Connection to the Mana Akheli Hospital

290. Sri V. N. PATIL (Humnabad).—

Will the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether the Government is aware that service connection has not been given to the Government Hospital at Mana Akheli in spite of the fact that the wiring had been done 3 years ago ;

(*b*) the reasons for the delay;

(*c*) the steps the Government has taken to remove the difficulties if any, and to give immediate service connection to the said Hospital;

(*d*) whether any litigation is pending in this behalf, if so, in which Court and who are the parties;

(*e*) whether any responsible official of Health Department has so far filed any affidavit in any Court, or has sought permission of the Court to allow service connection to be given to the Hospital pending disposal of the case with a view to avoid hardship to the parties;

(*f*) whether an official of P. W. D. Electrical has informed telegraphically to withhold giving service connection to the said Hospital in order to support one of the two contractors who claims to have done the wiring;

(*g*) if so, the time required by the Government to give service connection to the Hospital;

(*h*) whether the Government has made any alternative provision for light in the Hospital, if so, how much amount per month is granted and under what head of account ?

Sri BASAVARAJ MAGAVI (Deputy Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) The service connections have been given on 27th April 1969.

(*b*) and (*c*) Does not arise in view of reply to Clause (*a*).

(*d*) The Government is not aware of any litigation pending in the Court.

(*e*) No.

(*f*) The Executive Engineer, P. W. D., Electrical Division, Bangalore had at one stage informed the Assistant Engineer and the Supervisor telegraphically to withhold the work until further instructions from his end.

(*g*) and (*h*) Does not arise in view of reply to Clause (*a*).

Sri V. N. PATIL.—In answer to (*f*), may I know the reason for telegraphically asking the concerned officer not to give electric connection to the Mana Akheli Hospital ?

† Sri BASAVARAJ MAGAVI.—This electrical contract was originally given to one Lahoti Electricals, Gulbarga, at the beginning. The said concern did not execute the agreement nor commenced the work for more than 5 months. Afterwards the work was entrusted to Hindustan Electricals, Gulbarga, who commenced the work. M/s. Lahoti Electricals had lodged a complaint to the Executive Engineer (Elecl.), Bidar, to stop the work and hand it over to them. By this time, it was too late.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—The wiring had been done three years ago. Is there any litigation pending in this connection? Was it not the duty of the Government to find out whether there was any stay order, and if so, what steps were taken by the Government to vacate the stay order?

Sri BASAVARAJ MAGAVI.—Despite the efforts made to find out whether there was a litigation pending in the Court of Law, it was reported by the officers of the Health Department that there was no such litigation pending.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—If I furnish the Case number and the name of the Court where the suit is pending, may I know what steps the Government proposes to take against the officer responsible for this?

Sri BASAVARAJ MAGAVI.—If the hon. Member brings it to the notice of the Government, we are prepared to pull up the officer concerned and take necessary action.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now held-over Question No. 289.

Refusal to admit injured people in Humnabad Civil Dispensary

289. Sri V. N. PATIL (Humnabad).—

Will the Minister for Health be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether the Government has received any report of the incident dated 16th November 1968 at Ghotboral in Humnabad Taluk, Bidar District, wherein 4 persons were axed;

(*b*) whether it has come to the notice of the Government that those 4 persons (Maruthi of Ghotboral, Genoba of Chandanahalli, Shivaram of Chandanahalli and Madhava Rao of Chandanahalli) were not admitted by the doctor at Humnabad Civil Hospital in spite of the fact that were having deep injuries and profuse bleeding;

(*c*) whether any representation was received by the Government to institute an enquiry in the above matter;

(*d* if so, the action taken in this behalf (what is the latest position)?

Sri Y. RAMAKRISHNA (Minister for Health).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Yes; the Medical Officer, Civil Dispensary, Humnabad has reported that 3 persons were given necessary treatment as out-patients as their injuries did not require hospitalisation as in-patients and that the fourth person was advised to get himself admitted as in-patient but he refused to avail of the same.